

REMARKS

Claims 1-3 and 5-13 are present in this application. Claims 9-13 are new. Claims 1, 6, 8, and 9 are independent.

Claim Rejection - 112, second paragraph

Claims 6-8 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, as being indefinite because of the phrases "the mounted display substrate" and "the display substrate."

Claims 6 and 8 have been amended to remove the word "mounted" from the phrase "mounted display substrate," rendering the claims definite. Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claim Rejection - 35 USC 103; Akihiro, Koda

Claims 1-3, 6, and 7 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by JP 11-059893 (the Office Action refers to the document as "Akihiro"). Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the subject matter of claim 4. Claim 4 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Akihiro in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,287,991 (Koda et al., "Koda"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection based on the combination of Akihiro and Koda.

Claims 1-3

Claim 1 (as amended), in a preferred embodiment, is directed to a display substrate accommodating tray, comprising a

bottom section (e.g., bottom section 11) for mounting a display substrate (e.g., substrate 20) thereon in a substantially horizontal fashion, a frame (e.g., frame 12) for surrounding at least a part of the display substrate when the display substrate is mounted on the bottom section, an engaging section (e.g., engaging section 13), extending from a side surface of said frame, to be engaged by a carrying mechanism for carrying the display substrate accommodating tray having the display substrate mounted thereon, wherein a plurality of openings (e.g., openings 11a) are formed in the bottom section through which a plurality of supporting members are to be inserted for, when the display substrate is mounted on the bottom section, raising the display substrate above the bottom section.

Akihiro

Akihiro is directed to a substrate holder, conveyer and delivery stage. As can be seen in Fig. 6 of Akihiro, the substrate holder 21 is raised and lowered by an arm 16 that is inserted into an insertion hole 23 in substrate holder 21. A bottom section of the substrate holder includes a space for insertion of absorption pads. In addition, the bottom section of the substrate holder includes a lattice structure. Applicant submits that the arrangement in Akihiro is comparable to the arrangement disclosed in JP 10-287382, as disclosed in the present specification.

In particular, similar to the arrangement disclosed in the present application, the bottom section of the substrate holder in Akihiro includes a lattice structure, which effectively limits the number of substrate trays that can be stacked (as discussed in the specification at pages 4 and 5).

Koda

Koda is directed to a handle assembly for a laundry basket that prevents pain and injury to one's hands (Koda at column 1, lines 28-33). In particular, Koda discloses a laundry basket and a handle member 36 to be used with the laundry basket. Handle member 36 is used for baskets that have a peripheral rim (Koda, "Field of Invention"). The handle member has a curved exterior surface to facilitate the lifting and carrying of the basket.

Differences over Akihiro and Koda

The Office Action admits that Akihiro fails to teach a display substrate accommodating tray having an engaging section engageable with a carrying member. The Office Action instead relies on Koda for teaching the claimed engaging section (handle member 36). Applicant disagrees that Koda's handle member 36 constitutes the claimed engaging section, extending from a side surface of the frame, to be engaged by a carrying mechanism for carrying the display substrate accommodating tray.

The handle member 36 of Koda is designed with a curved surface so as to prevent the handle from cutting or hurting the user's hands ("Background of the Invention"; column 1, lines 31-33, 57-62). Koda's handle member includes interlocked top and bottom portions which are positioned above and below the rim. Unlike the handle member 36 in Koda, the engaging section of the claimed invention extends from a side surface of the frame.

Thus, Applicant submits that Koda fails to teach or suggest the claimed engaging section, extending from a side surface of the frame. An advantage of the engaging section of the present invention is that an insertion space is unnecessary, resulting in a thinner accommodating tray. Accordingly, Applicant submits that the rejection fails to establish *prima facie* obviousness for claim 1 (as amended to incorporate claim 4).

Furthermore, Applicants submit that an insufficient basis is provided for the motivation to combine Akihiro and Koda. The Office Action states that a motivation to combine Akihiro and Koda is "to provide convenience for transporting the tray to a different location." Applicants submit that the statement of motivation constitutes a broad conclusory statement.

To establish obviousness based on a combination of elements disclosed in the prior art, there must be some motivation, suggestion, or teaching of the desirability of making the specific combination that was made by the applicant. The motivation suggestion or teaching may come explicitly from the statements in

the prior art, the knowledge of one of ordinary skill art, or in some cases, the nature of the problem to be solved. See Dembiczak 50 USPQ at 1614 (Fed.Cir. 1999). In Kotzab, the CAFC held that even though various elements of the claimed invention were present (in two separate embodiments of the same prior art reference), there was no motivation to combine the elements from the separate embodiments, based on the teachings in the prior art.

In order to establish a prima facie case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), the Examiner must provide particular findings as to why the two pieces of prior art are combinable. See Dembiczak 50 USPQ2d at 1617. Broad conclusory statements standing alone are not "evidence".

Koda applies specifically to a handle for a laundry basket. Koda does not explicitly disclose application of its handle member 36 as a holder for conveying a thin plate-shaped conveyed object of a large area, such as that disclosed in Akihiro. Applicant submits that one of ordinary skill in the art of conveyer's would not seek the teachings of Koda with respect to holders for thin plate-shaped objects of large area. Furthermore, Akihiro requires a space for insertion of an arm that raises and lowers the substrate holder. The present invention solves the problem of Akihiro by including, instead, an engaging section, extending from a side surface of the frame. There is no indication in either Akihiro or Koda that they are concerned with a problem of eliminating the space between substrate holders. Thus, Applicant submits that there is no motivation to combine Akihiro and Koda.

For at least this additional reason, Applicant submits that the rejection fails to establish *prima facie* obviousness for claim 1. For the same reasons as in the above for claim 1, the rejection fails to establish *prima facie* obviousness for claims 2 and 3, as well.

Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claim Rejection - 35 USC 102

Claims 1-3, 6, and 7 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by JP 11-059893 (the Office Action refers to the document as "Akihiro"). Applicant respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claims 6 and 7

Claim 6, in a preferred embodiment, is directed to an apparatus for removing a display substrate (e.g., substrate 20) from a display substrate accommodating tray (e.g., accommodating tray 10), the display substrate accommodating tray including a bottom section (e.g., bottom section 11) for mounting a display substrate thereon in a substantially horizontal fashion, with a plurality of openings (e.g., openings 11a) being formed in the bottom section, and a frame (e.g., frame 12) for surrounding at least a part of the display substrate when the display substrate is mounted on the bottom section, the apparatus comprising a

plurality of first supporting members (e.g., support pins 43) for, while the display substrate is mounted on the bottom section, raising the display substrate above the bottom section, and a second supporting member (e.g., elevated table 42) for supporting the display substrate accommodating tray as the display substrate is raised above the accommodating tray, wherein the plurality of first supporting members raise the display substrate by being inserted into the plurality of openings respectively and penetrating through the bottom section and moving the display substrate upward from the display substrate accommodating tray.

The Office Action states that lid 28 of Akihiro teaches the claimed second support member. Applicant submits that the lid 28 of Akihiro is not for supporting the display substrate accommodating tray as the display substrate is raised above the accommodating tray, and thus, does not constitute the claimed second support member.

Thus, Applicant submits that Akihiro fails to teach or suggest each and every claimed element of claim 6. This same argument applies as well to claim 7.

Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claim Rejection - 35 USC 103; Akihiro, Nakajima

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Akihiro in view of JP 2003-236953 (Nakajima et al., "Nakajima"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claim 5 depends from claim 1. Thus, at least for the reasons above for claim 1, Applicant submits that the rejection fails to establish *prima facie* obviousness for claim 5, as well.

Nakajima discloses a manufacturing method that incorporates a foamed sheet body 10. Applicant submits that Nakajima fails to teach or suggest the claimed engaging section. Thus, Nakajima fails to make up for the deficiency of claim 1. Accordingly, at least for this additional reason, Akihiro, Koda, and Nakajima, either alone or in combination, fail to teach each and every claimed element of claim 5.

Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claim Rejection - 35 USC 103; Akihiro

Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Akihiro. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claim 8 is directed to a method for removing a display substrate (substrate 20) from a display substrate accommodating tray (accommodating tray 10), the display substrate accommodating tray including a bottom section (bottom section

11) for mounting the display substrate thereon in a substantially horizontal fashion, with a plurality of openings (openings 11a) being formed in the bottom section, a frame (frame 12) for surrounding at least a part of the display substrate when the display substrate is mounted on the bottom section, and an engaging section (engaging section 13), extending from a side surface of said frame, to be engaged by a carrying mechanism for carrying the display substrate accommodating tray having the display substrate mounted thereon, the method comprising the steps of

while the display substrate is mounted on the bottom section, engaging the display substrate accommodating tray at the engaging section by said carrying mechanism from above the accommodating tray and positioning the openings of the bottom section to be coincident with a position of a plurality of supporting members (Fig. 6),

moving a plurality of supporting members upward relative to the display substrate accommodating tray, thereby inserting the plurality of supporting members into the plurality of openings respectively (Fig. 7), and

raising the display substrate above the bottom section by penetrating the plurality of supporting members through the accommodating tray (Fig. 7).

A similar argument as in the above for claim 1, applies as well to claim 8. Applicants submit that Akihiro fails to teach or suggest the claimed step of engaging the display substrate accommodating tray at the engaging section. In particular, Akihiro fails to teach or suggest the claimed engaging section extending from a side surface of the frame, for which the carrying mechanism engages the engaging section from above the accommodating tray.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that Akihiro fails to teach each and every element of claim 8.

Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

New Claims

Claims 9-13 have been added. New claim 9 is comparable to claim 1. New claims 10, 11, and 12 depend from claim 9 and are comparable to claims 2, 3, and 5, respectively. Claim 13 recites the added feature of the engaging section for the apparatus of claim 6. Thus, at least for the reasons given above for claims 1 and 6, Applicant submits that new claims 9-13 are patentable as well.

Conclusion

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Robert W. Downs (Reg. No. 48,222) at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By 
Charles Gorenstein, Reg. 29,271

RWD
CG/RWD/ph

P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000